

**REMARKS**

The Office Communication dated February 9, 2006, contends that the Amendment filed November 16, 2005, is non-responsive. In that Amendment, Applicants traversed the assertion that claims 31-39 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the subject matter of the original claims. The communication dated February 9, 2006, does not address the substance of Applicants' arguments as required by M.P.E.P. §812.01.

While Applicants maintain that the restriction requirement is improper, for the reasons presented in the previous Amendment, to advance prosecution claims 30-39 are being cancelled, along with withdrawn claims 5, 25, 26 and 28.


New claims 40-44 are directed to a smart card, and are therefore consistent with the subject matter of the original claims. New claims 45 and 46 are directed to a combination of various features recited in examined claims 1 and 4.

All pending claims are submitted to be patentable over the prior art of record, consistent with the indication of allowability set forth in the Office Action dated September 16, 2005. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: March 13, 2006

By:   
James A. LaBarre  
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620